

HOSTED BY

Contents lists available at [ScienceDirect](http://www.sciencedirect.com)

## Alexandria Journal of Medicine

journal homepage: <http://www.elsevier.com/locate/ajme>

## Original Article

## Relationship between body mass index, waist circumference, waist hip ratio and erosive gastroesophageal reflux disease in a tertiary centre in Nigeria: A case control study

Olusegun Adeganle<sup>a,\*</sup>, Samuel Anu Olowookere<sup>b</sup>, Oluwasegun Ijarotimi<sup>a</sup>, Dennis Amajuoyi Ndububa<sup>a</sup>, Akinwumi Oluwole Komolafe<sup>c</sup><sup>a</sup> Faculty of Clinical Sciences, Department of Medicine, Obafemi Awolowo University and Obafemi Awolowo University Teaching Hospitals, Ile-Ife, Osun State, Nigeria<sup>b</sup> Faculty of Clinical Sciences, Department of Community Health, Obafemi Awolowo University and Obafemi Awolowo University Teaching Hospitals, Ile-Ife, Osun State, Nigeria<sup>c</sup> Faculty of Basic Medical Sciences, Department of Morbid Anatomy, Obafemi Awolowo University and Obafemi Awolowo University Teaching Hospitals, Ile-Ife, Osun State, Nigeria

## ARTICLE INFO

## Article history:

Received 4 April 2018

Revised 29 August 2018

Accepted 5 October 2018

Available online 30 November 2018

## Keywords:

Gastro esophageal reflux

Central obesity

Dyspepsia

Nigeria

## ABSTRACT

**Background:** Gastro-oesophageal reflux disease (GERD) is a condition that develops when the reflux of stomach content causes troublesome symptoms with or without mucosa damage and or complications. GERD is believed to be evolving among blacks.**Objectives:** The objective of this study was to look at the relationship of GERD to body mass index (BMI), waist circumference (WC), hip circumference (HC) and waist hip ratio (WHR) among patients with distal oesophageal erosive GERD and controls.**Methods:** A case control study among patients with dyspepsia that had diagnostic upper gastrointestinal endoscopy. Patients with erosive GERD were grouped into cases while those without GERD were controls. GERD was graded using the Los Angeles classification. BMI, WC, HC and WHR were measured among cases and controls. Obesity was defined as BMI  $\geq 30$  kg/m<sup>2</sup> or WC  $\geq 88$  cm or  $\geq$ WHR 0.85 in females and BMI  $\geq 30$  kg/m<sup>2</sup> or WHR  $\geq 0.9$  or WC  $\geq 102$  cm for males. Data were analysed using descriptive and inferential statistics.**Results:** A total of 160 subjects (80 cases and 80 controls) were analysed. Mean (SD) age for cases was 51.1 ( $\pm 12.4$ ) years and 50.1 ( $\pm 13.7$ ) years for controls. When cases with GERD were compared with controls; males were less likely to be obese, BMI  $< 30$  kg/m<sup>2</sup>, have normal WC, HC and WHR while females were more likely to be obese, BMI  $\geq 30$  kg/m<sup>2</sup> and have increased WC, and HC, ( $p < 0.05$ ).**Conclusion:** Central obesity is a risk factor for distal oesophageal erosive GERD among female Nigerians but not among males.© 2018 Alexandria University Faculty of Medicine. Production and hosting by Elsevier B.V. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

## 1. Introduction

Gastro-oesophageal reflux disease (GERD) is a condition that develops when the reflux of stomach content causes troublesome symptoms with or without mucosa damage and or complications. At upper gastro-intestinal endoscopy, GERD may be erosive (when there is visible erosions) or non-erosive (when there is no visible mucosa erosion). Heartburn and regurgitation are typical symptoms of reflux experienced by patients.<sup>1,2</sup> GERD is one of the most prevalent clinical conditions affecting the gastro-intestinal tract. Associated conditions that have been established to occur with

GERD include the Zollinger Ellison syndrome (ZES) and connective tissue disease like scleroderma.<sup>3</sup> Central obesity has been fairly reasonably shown from studies outside Nigeria to be associated with GERD.<sup>4–8</sup> Among patients with obesity, studies have shown that central deposition of fat relates more to reflux symptoms than peripheral deposition of fat.<sup>9</sup> Other conditions that have been shown to be associated with GERD include pregnancy, cigarette smoking, and the use of drugs like the nitrates, calcium channel blockers, beta blockers and aminophylline.<sup>10</sup> Surgical destruction of the lower oesophageal sphincter or balloon dilatation also renders the gastro-oesophageal valve incompetent.<sup>10</sup> Few studies have shown an association between GERD and central obesity in Nigeria and many of these are questionnaire based with only one or so that was based on diagnostic upper gastro-intestinal endoscopy.

Peer review under responsibility of Alexandria University Faculty of Medicine.

\* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: [olusegunadekanle@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:olusegunadekanle@yahoo.co.uk) (O. Adeganle).<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajme.2018.10.001>

2090-5068/© 2018 Alexandria University Faculty of Medicine. Production and hosting by Elsevier B.V.

This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

Therefore, the aim of this study was to assess the association between central obesity, defined by using the body mass index, waist circumference and waist-hip ratio and distal oesophageal erosive GERD among patients with dyspepsia undergoing upper gastrointestinal endoscopy in Ile-Ife, Nigeria

## 2. Methods

### 2.1. Study design and patients

This was a case control study involving patients diagnosed endoscopically with and without distal oesophageal erosive GERD (cases and controls). The study was conducted at the endoscopy unit of the Obafemi Awolowo University Teaching Hospital, Ile-Ife, Nigeria between March 2013 and December 2015. All patients with dyspepsia that had diagnostic upper gastrointestinal endoscopy were screened for distal oesophageal erosive GERD. Patients with distal oesophageal erosive GERD (cases) were age and sex matched with patients having dyspepsia but without distal oesophageal erosive GERD (controls). Participants were excluded if they smoked cigarette, were pregnant, or were on nasogastric tube prior to endoscopy. Patients with gastro-intestinal bleeding or gastric outlet obstruction or those with oesophageal or gastric cancer were also excluded. Ethical consideration involved taking informed consent from participants for the study. The Ethics and Research Committee of the hospital reviewed and approved the study with numbers IRB/IEC 00005422 & NHREC/27/02/2009a.

### 2.2. Procedures

A forward viewing gastroscope, Pentax FG-29W Model with a video monitor, was used. Cases and controls who gave written consents for the procedure had an endoscopic pre-medication of 10% xylocaine sprayed into the pharynx and a parenteral Midazolam or Diazepam of between 2.5 mg and 5 mg as well as 20 mg Hyosine to induce smooth muscle relaxation. Cases and controls thereafter had the procedure performed on them. The lower end of the oesophagus was visualized and any erosive mucosa break was noted and graded according to the Los Angeles (LA) grading system.<sup>11</sup> The LA grading system is detailed as follows: 1. LA Grade A, One (or more) mucosal break no longer than 5 mm that does not extend between the tops of two mucosal folds. II- LA Grade B, One (or more) mucosal break no longer than 5 mm that does not extend between the tops of two mucosal folds. III-LA Grade C, One (or more) mucosal break that is continuous between the tops of two or more mucosa folds, but involves less than 75% of the esophageal circumference. IV-LA Grade D, One (or more) mucosal breaks that involves at least 75% of the esophageal circumference. Thereafter, participants were allowed to recover after the procedure under observation.

### 2.3. Data collection

Socio-demographic characteristics and anthropometric data were taken for cases and controls and these included the body mass index (BMI), waist circumference (WC), hip circumference (HC) and waist-hip ratio (WHR). The value for the body mass index was calculated using the weight in kilogram divided by the square of the height in metres. Waist circumference was measured in centimetres at a midpoint between the lowermost rib and the anterior superior iliac spine with a non-stretch tape. Hip circumference was measured in centimetres at the widest portion of the hip. The value for the waist-hip ratio was obtained by dividing the waist circumference in metres by the hip circumference also in metres.

### 2.4. Statistical analysis

Data were entered into SPSS version 20 software and analysed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Frequencies and means were generated. Cases and control groups were divided into two groups of obese and normal patients using the body mass index (BMI), waist circumference (WC) and the waist-hip ratio (WHR) according to the World Health Organisation criteria.<sup>12,13</sup> Result of the division was categorised into the various grades of GERD for cases. Mean values of BMI, WC, HC and WHR were calculated for both cases and controls. Categorical variables were compared using the Chi-square test, while continuous variables were compared using a Student's *t* test. Significant level was put at  $p \leq 0.05$ .

## 3. Results

### 3.1. Participants' characteristics

A total of 160 participants completed the study, comprising 80 cases with distal oesophageal erosive GERD and 80 controls without distal oesophageal erosive GERD (Table 1). The cases represented 16% among 500 patients that had upper gastro-intestinal endoscopy during the study period in the gastro-intestinal unit of the hospital alone. Majority of the cases and controls were within the age group of 41–60 years. The age of the index cases ranged from 21 to 77 years with a mean (SD) of 51.1 ( $\pm 12.4$ ) years, while the controls ranged from 22 to 78 years with a mean (SD) of 50.1 ( $\pm 13.7$ ) years. There were 29 males and 51 females for both cases and controls with an M: F ratio of approximately 1:2. The occupations of the cases with distal oesophageal erosive GERD were civil servants 36 (45%), artisans 5 (6.3%), traders 26 (32.5%) and the unemployed 13 (16.3%). Those of the controls were civil servants, 38 (47.5%), artisans 9 (11.3%), traders 16 (20%) and the unemployed 17 (21.3%).

### 3.2. Anthropometric indices of participants and GERD

All male cases with distal oesophageal erosive GERD had BMI below 30 kg/m<sup>2</sup> and with a higher proportion of 44.8% in the LA grade A. The proportion of cases reduced progressively in the LA grades to 13.8% in the grade D category (Table 2). The proportion of males with GERD in the WHR  $\geq 0.9$  category was more than those in the WHR  $< 0.9$  category. Again, a greater proportion of these cases (45.8%) were in LA grade A than other grades. On the other hand, male cases with GERD and WC  $< 102$  cm were in higher proportion than those with WC  $\geq 102$  cm (Table 2).

Females with GERD who had WC  $> 88$  cm, or WHR  $> 0.85$ , had higher grades of GERD than women who did not reach these thresholds of WC or WHR. On the other hand, most women with GERD and a BMI  $> 30$  kg/m<sup>2</sup> had GERD in the LA grades of C and D. Women with GERD and a BMI  $< 30$  kg/m<sup>2</sup> however had GERD mostly in the LA grades of A and B respectively (Table 2).

When the cases of GERD were compared with controls, the proportion of male cases with GERD and BMI  $< 30$  kg/m<sup>2</sup> was higher than those with BMI  $> 30$  kg/m<sup>2</sup>, though this did not reach a statistical significance,  $p > 0.05$ . There was no statistically significant difference in the proportion of male cases that were obese and had GERD, based on their WC and WHR and those that were not obese compared with controls,  $p > 0.05$ . There was a significantly higher number of females with GERD on endoscopy with obesity, defined by BMI or WC, compared with controls,  $p < 0.05$  (Table 3).

The mean values of BMI, WC, WHR and HC among male cases compared with controls were not statistically significant ( $p > 0.05$ ), while on the other hand, the mean values of the BMI, WC and HC for female cases compared with controls were all sta-

**Table 1**

Baseline characteristics of patients and controls.

| Participants          | Variables<br>Age group (yrs) | Cases<br>No (%) | Controls<br>No (%) | X <sup>2</sup> | P value            |
|-----------------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|--------------------|
| All patients          | 21–40                        | 16 (43.2)       | 21 (56.8)          | 0.886          | 0.642 <sup>*</sup> |
|                       | 41–60                        | 46 (52.2)       | 42 (47.7)          |                |                    |
|                       | >60                          | 18 (51.4)       | 17 (48.6)          |                |                    |
| Males                 | 21–40                        | 8 (42.1)        | 11 (57.9)          | 1.886          | 0.389 <sup>*</sup> |
|                       | 41–60                        | 13 (61.9)       | 8 (38.1)           |                |                    |
|                       | >60                          | 8 (44.4)        | 10 (55.6)          |                |                    |
| Females               | 21–40                        | 8 (44.4)        | 10 (55.6)          | 1.008          | 0.604 <sup>*</sup> |
|                       | 41–60                        | 33 (49.3)       | 34 (50.7)          |                |                    |
|                       | >60                          | 10 (58.8)       | 7 (41.2)           |                |                    |
| BMI kg/m <sup>2</sup> | <18.5                        | 4 (50)          | 4 (50)             | 10.166         | 0.071 <sup>*</sup> |
|                       | 16.5–24.9                    | 23 (37.1)       | 39 (62.9)          |                |                    |
|                       | 25–29.9                      | 27 (51.9)       | 25 (48.1)          |                |                    |
|                       | 30–34.9                      | 16 (64)         | 9 (36)             |                |                    |
|                       | 35–39.9                      | 9 (75)          | 3 (25)             |                |                    |
|                       | >40                          | 1 (100)         |                    |                |                    |
| Occupation            | Civil servants               | 36 (51.4)       | 38 (46.6)          | 14.606         | 0.002 <sup>*</sup> |
|                       | Artisans                     | 5 (23.8)        | 16 (76.2)          |                |                    |
|                       | Traders                      | 26 (74.3)       | 9 (25.7)           |                |                    |
|                       | Unemployed                   | 13 (56.7)       | 17 (43.3)          |                |                    |

<sup>\*</sup> Pearson's Chi Square.**Table 2**

Grades of GERD, WC, WHR and BMI of patients group.

| Variables                  | GERD<br>Grade A<br>N (%) | GRADES<br>Grade B<br>N (%) | Grade C<br>N (%) | Grade D<br>N (%) | X <sup>2</sup> | P value             |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| <b>Males (29)</b>          |                          |                            |                  |                  |                |                     |
| BMI < 30 kg/m <sup>2</sup> | 13 (44.8)                | 8 (27.6)                   | 4 (13.8)         | 4 (13.8)         | 2.004          | 0.572 <sup>**</sup> |
| BMI ≥ 30 kg/m <sup>2</sup> | 0                        | 0                          | 0                | 0                |                |                     |
| WHR < 0.9                  | 2 (40)                   | 2 (40)                     | 1 (20)           | 0                |                |                     |
| WHR ≥ 0.9                  | 11 (45.8)                | 6 (25)                     | 3 (12.5)         | 4 (16.7)         | 3.109          | 0.375 <sup>*</sup>  |
| WC < 102 cm                | 11 (44)                  | 6 (24)                     | 4 (16)           | 4 (16)           |                |                     |
| WC ≥ 102 cm                | 2 (50)                   | 2 (50)                     | 0                | 0                |                |                     |
| <b>Females (51)</b>        |                          |                            |                  |                  |                |                     |
| BMI < 30Kg/m <sup>2</sup>  | 9 (36)                   | 5 (20)                     | 5 (20)           | 6 (24)           | 1.350          | 0.717 <sup>*</sup>  |
| BMI ≥ 30Kg/m <sup>2</sup>  | 6 (23.1)                 | 5 (19.2)                   | 8 (30.7)         | 7 (26.9)         |                |                     |
| WHR < 0.85                 | 4 (50)                   | 2 (25)                     | 0                | 2 (25)           | 5.496          | 0.139 <sup>*</sup>  |
| WHR ≥ 0.85                 | 12 (27.9)                | 8 (18.6)                   | 13 (30.2)        | 10 (23.3)        |                |                     |
| WC < 88 cm                 | 3 (27.2)                 | 3 (27.2)                   | 1 (9.1)          | 4 (36.4)         | 3.195          | 0.363 <sup>*</sup>  |
| WC ≥ 88 cm                 | 13 (32.5)                | 7 (17.5)                   | 12 (30)          | 8 (20)           |                |                     |

<sup>\*</sup> Pearson's Chi Square.<sup>\*\*</sup> Likelihood ratio.**Table 3**

BMI, WC, WHR and SEX of cases and controls.

| Variables                  | Cases<br>No (%) | Controls<br>No (%) | X <sup>2</sup> | P value             |
|----------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| <b>Males (29)</b>          |                 |                    |                |                     |
| BMI < 30 kg/m <sup>2</sup> | 29 (52.7)       | 26 (47.3)          | 1.506          | 0.237 <sup>**</sup> |
| BMI ≥ 30 kg/m <sup>2</sup> | 0               | 3 (100)            |                | 0.220 <sup>*</sup>  |
| WHR < 0.9                  | 5 (35.7)        | 9 (64.3)           |                |                     |
| WHR ≥ 0.9                  | 24 (54.5)       | 20 (45.5)          |                |                     |
| WC < 102 cm                | 25 (50)         | 25 (50)            |                |                     |
| WC ≥ 102 cm                | 4 (50)          | 4 (50)             |                |                     |
| <b>Females (51)</b>        |                 |                    |                |                     |
| BMI < 30 kg/m <sup>2</sup> | 25 (37.3)       | 42 (62.7)          | 12.124         | 0.0001 <sup>+</sup> |
| BMI ≥ 30 kg/m <sup>2</sup> | 26 (74.3)       | 9 (25.7)           | 3.487          | 0.062 <sup>*</sup>  |
| WHR < 0.85                 | 8 (33.3)        | 16 (66.7)          |                |                     |
| WHR ≥ 0.85                 | 43 (55.1)       | 35 (43.7)          | 5.420          | 0.020 <sup>*</sup>  |
| WC < 88 cm                 | 11 (51.2)       | 22 (44.9)          |                |                     |
| WC ≥ 88 cm                 | 40 (58)         | 29 (42.0)          |                |                     |

<sup>\*</sup> Pearson's Chi square.<sup>\*\*</sup> Fischer's exact test.

**Table 4**

Mean values of anthropometric indices of Cases and controls.

| Variables                  | Cases          | Controls      | T test  | P value            |
|----------------------------|----------------|---------------|---------|--------------------|
| <b>Males (29)</b>          |                |               |         |                    |
| Mean BMI kg/m <sup>2</sup> | 24.2 ± 3.7     | 23.7 ± 4.1    | −0.554  | 0.582              |
| Mean WC                    | 85.8 ± 15.9    | 86.7 ± 13.6   | −0.306  | 0.819              |
| Mean WHR                   | 0.97 ± 0.14    | 0.93 ± 0.07   | −0.567  | 0.206              |
| Mean Hip Circ**            | 88.94 ± 16.22  | 92.02 ± 10.34 | 0.860   | 0.394              |
| <b>Females (51)</b>        |                |               |         |                    |
| Mean BMI                   | 29.45 ± 6.21   | 25.93 ± 5.22  | −0.3096 | 0.003 <sup>*</sup> |
| Mean WC                    | 96.83 ± 12.92  | 89.12 ± 12.47 | −3.068  | 0.003 <sup>*</sup> |
| Mean WHR                   | 0.90 ± 0.078   | 0.89 ± 0.11   | −0.567  | 0.572              |
| Mean Hip circ**            | 107.16 ± 11.88 | 99.61 ± 12.27 | −3.158  | 0.002 <sup>*</sup> |

Keys:

<sup>\*</sup> Statistically significant.<sup>\*\*</sup> Mean hip circ = Mean hip circumference.

tistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ). The mean values of WHR between cases and controls were not statistically significant for females,  $p > 0.05$  (Table 4).

#### 4. Discussion

In this study of patients with distal oesophageal erosive GERD, only eighty cases were seen over a period of two years and nine months in the gastro-intestinal unit alone. This may imply that the condition is not common among Nigerians. This finding agrees with previous reports from Nigeria that showed that the prevalence of the disease is low in the country and even among people from Africa living in Europe.<sup>14–16</sup> There is a study however that reported that the most common endoscopic finding among patients with dyspepsia in the densely populated city of Lagos in Nigeria was GERD.<sup>17</sup> This is in contrast with the findings in this semi-urban town of the same Southwest zone of Nigeria. The reason for the difference may be due to lifestyle and affluence associated with the urban centre. Urban cities may probably have more cases of people with central obesity and the diet of the people may also play a role. Affluence and western life style have been shown to influence the occurrence of GERD among low risk population like Nigeria.<sup>18</sup>

The prevalence of GERD in other parts of Africa varies from 24% in Tunisia to 47% among patients with GERD symptoms in Sudan.<sup>19,20</sup>

Affluence may play a more central role as has been shown in this study of cases with GERD in which central obesity was a risk factor among females. The reason why females were more affected is not clear for now, but may be related to hormonal factors.<sup>21,22</sup> The female hormones, oestrogens, may actually encourage tendency to develop central obesity, besides sedentary lifestyle and leptin released from fat deposits.

GERD was found mainly among civil servants, followed by traders. This differs slightly from the study by Akere et al. in another urban setting of Southwest Nigeria. The study found GERD mainly among traders and students. This, however, was a questionnaire based study and would have included cases having both erosive and non-erosive distal oesophageal GERD. Despite these differences, the study found GERD to be common among females similar to the findings in this study.<sup>23</sup>

GERD has been shown to be associated with central obesity among the white population, and they also have the severe forms of the disease.<sup>18</sup> In our study, majority of the cases had the mild forms of GERD. This supports previous reports in the literature.<sup>18,24</sup> It may thus point to the fact that GERD is evolving among people from Africa, a fact that has been raised among researchers in Kenya.<sup>25</sup> Among people from Africa, few studies have shown an association between central obesity and GERD. A study from

Southwest Nigeria reported a weak association between central obesity and GERD.<sup>23</sup> However, this was a questionnaire based study.

Another study from Eastern Nigeria reported a positive association between GERD and central obesity using the BMI among patients that had diagnostic upper gastro-intestinal endoscopy.<sup>24</sup> Our study has however gone a step higher to show that GERD is actually associated with increased body mass index and waist circumference (BMI & WC) among female patients in our environment. Body mass index, waist circumference and waist hip ratio among males were not significantly associated with the occurrence of GERD in our study. The reason for this may be due to the small sample size of males in our study. Another reason may be the influence of leptin released from fat deposits. The males in this study were not obese based on the BMI. Obesity, particularly the central type with increased leptin levels have been associated with clinically and endoscopically severe GERD.<sup>25</sup> WHR was not associated with GERD among female cases compared with controls, though WC was. It may be that female cases with GERD equally had high HC, as shown by the mean value of HC among cases and controls which was statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).

Among people with obesity having GERD, abdominal fat is implicated as the cause of the disease because cytokines are released from the fat deposits that relax the gastro-oesophageal sphincter.<sup>5,21</sup> Our study has demonstrated that accumulation of abdominal fat in females in our environment is associated with GERD as has been reported among affluent Whites in the western countries.<sup>21</sup> The mechanism for this may be that patients with central obesity may develop increased intra-abdominal pressure leading to GERD. GERD itself may develop at varying stages of fat accumulation depending on genetic predisposition.

The mean age of patients with GERD in our study was lower than that from western countries and this agrees with the report by Loffeld et al.<sup>16</sup> which showed that the mean age among Black immigrants with GERD was about a decade lower than that among Dutch patients with GERD. The lower mean age in our study also agrees with another report from Southwest Nigeria.<sup>26</sup>

#### 4.1. Limitations of the study

This was a hospital based study on distal oesophageal erosive GERD; some patients without erosive GERD may have had a non erosive reflux disease (NERD).

#### 5. Conclusion

GERD may be evolving among Nigerians. The disease tends to be in the early grades in our environment and appears more common among women than men. Central obesity as defined by the

body mass index and waist circumference are clear risk factors among women in Nigeria.

### Acknowledgement

The authors acknowledge the great contributions of our endoscopy nurses in making this work possible. They serve both the Medical and Surgical teams. We thank them all.

### Financial support and sponsorship

Nil.

### Conflict of interest

We the authors declare no conflict of interest.

### Contributors' list

AO was involved in the conception and design as well as writing of this manuscript, OSA did the statistical analysis, IO read and approved the final version of the article, NDA was involved in the conception and design of this article. KAO was involved in the writing of the manuscript. All authors approved the final version of the manuscript.

### References

1. Fock KM, Talley NJ, Fass R, et al.. Asia-Pacific consensus on the management of gastroesophageal reflux disease: update. *J Gastroenterol Hepatol*. 2008;23:8–22.
2. Vakil N, van-Zanten SV, Kahrilas P, Dent J, Jones R, Global consensus Group. The Montreal definition and classification of gastroesophageal reflux disease: a global evidence-based consensus paper. *Z Gastroenterol*. 2007;45:1125–1140.
3. Kahrilas PJ. *Gastroesophageal Reflux Disease and its complications in: Sleisenger and Fordtran's Gastrointestinal and Liver diseases*. 6th ed. WB Saunders Company Publishers; 1998. 498–517.
4. Nocon M, Labenz J, Jaspersen D, et al.. Association of body mass index with heartburn, regurgitation, and oesophagitis: result of the progression of Gastroesophageal Reflux disease study. *J Gastroenterol Hepatol*. 2007;22:1728–1731.
5. Lee HL, Eun CS, Lee OY, et al.. Association between GERD-related erosive oesophagitis and obesity. *J Clin Gastroenterol*. 2008;42:672–675.
6. Kendrick ML, Houghton SG. Gastroesophageal Reflux disease in obese patients: the role of obesity in management. *Dis Esophagus*. 2006;19:57–63.
7. Ebrahimi-Mameghani M, Saghafi-Asl M, Arefhosseini S, Khoshtaten M. Is there association between overweight, obesity and reflux disease? *Pak J Biol Sci*. 2008;11:443–447.
8. El-Serag H. The association between obesity and GERD: a review of the epidemiological evidence. *Dig Dis Sci*. 2008;53:2307–2312.
9. Friedenberg FK, Xanthopoulos M, Foster GD, Richter JE. The association between gastroesophageal reflux disease and obesity. *Am J Gastroenterol*. 2008;103:2111–2122.
10. Goyal RK. Diseases of the Esophagus. In: Fauci AS, Braunwald E, Isselbacher KJ, eds. *Harrisons Principles of Internal Medicine*. 14th ed. USA: Mc Graw-Hill Publishers; 1998:1588–1596.
11. Dent J. Endoscopic grading of reflux oesophagitis: the past, present and future. *Best Pract Res Clin Gastroenterol*. 2008;22:585–599.
12. Waist circumference and waist-hip ratio. Report of a WHO expert consultation Geneva 8–11, December 2008. Published in 2011.
13. WHO. *physical status: the use and interpretation of anthropometry*. Report of a WHO Expert Committee. WHO Technical Report Series 854. Geneva: World Health Organisation; 1995.
14. Olokoba AB, Bojuwoye BJ. Indications for oesophagoduodenoscopy in Ilorin, Nigeria—a 30 month review. *Niger J Clin Pract*. 2010;13:260–263.
15. Olokoba AB, Olokoba LB, Jimoh AA, Salawu FK, Danburam A, Ehalaiye BF. Upper gastrointestinal tract endoscopy indications in northern Nigeria. *J Coll Physicians Surg Pak*. 2009;19:327–328.
16. Loffeld RJ, van der Putten AB. Prevalence of gastroesophageal reflux disease in immigrants living in the Zaanstreek region in the Netherlands. *Dis Esophagus*. 2004;17:87–90.
17. Onyekwere CA, Hameed H, Anomneze EE, Chibututu C. Upper gastrointestinal endoscopy findings in Nigerians: a review of 170 cases in Lagos. *Niger Postgrad Med J*. 2008;15:126–129.
18. Sonnenberg A. Effects of environment and lifestyle on gastroesophageal reflux disease. *Dig Dis*. 2011;29:229–234.
19. Ahmed HH, Mudawi HM, Fedail SS. Gastro-oesophageal reflux disease in Sudan: a clinical endoscopic and histopathological study. *Tropical Gastroenterol*. 2004;25:135–138.
20. Ben Chaabane N, El Jeridi N, Ben Salem K, et al.. Prevalence of gastroesophageal reflux in a Tunisian primary care population determined by patient interview. *Dis Esophagus*. 2012;25:4–9.
21. Chung SJ, Kim D, Park MJ, et al.. Metabolic syndrome and visceral obesity as risk factors for reflux oesophagitis: a cross sectional case control study of 7078 Koreans undergoing health check-ups. *Gut*. 2008;57:1360–1365.
22. Masaka T, Lijima K, Endo H, et al.. Gender differences in oesophageal mucosal injury in a reflux oesophagitis model rats. *Gut*. 2013;62:6–14.
23. Akere A, Adebosoye LA, Afolabi BA. Association between body mass index and gastroesophageal reflux disease in blacks. *Niger J Gastroenterol Hepatol*. 2010;2:91–96.
24. Nwokediuko S, Ijoma U, Obienu O, Agunyenwa C. Gastroesophageal reflux disease a clinical and endoscopic study of Nigerian patients. *Internet J Gastroenterol*. 2009;8. article 2.
25. Abdelkader NA, Montasser IF, Bioumy EE, Saad WE. Impact of anthropometric measures and serum leptin on severity of gastroesophageal reflux disease. *Dis Esophagus*. 2015;28:691–698.
26. Lodenyo H, Rana F, Mutuma GZ, Kabanga JM, Kuria JK, Okoth FA. Patterns of upper gastrointestinal diseases based on endoscopy in the period 1998–2001. *Afr J Health Sci*. 2005;12:49–54.